

for war making Saddam Hussein develop and possesses, he will use. And that is why it is so critical to deny him that capacity.

The specific course that President Clinton and some of those of our allies who seem more likely to stand with us—such as the British, probably the Turkish, others, hopefully in the moderate nations of the Arab world—the specific course that President Clinton as Commander in Chief chooses to take is, of course, respectfully his judgment. But I hope in the fateful days that are ahead when this Congress is out of session and these decisions will probably have to be made that the President appreciates what I sense as I talk to colleagues here in the Senate, that there is a broad bipartisan understanding of the seriousness of the challenge that Saddam Hussein has cleverly and diabolically set before us; and that there will be broad bipartisan support for an effective response as determined by the President of the United States, hopefully in joint action with a large number of our allies.

So, Mr. President, this has been a long session—a session of extraordinary accomplishments, certainly on the balanced budget, and some disappointment, of course, as always is the case in other areas.

But, as we depart, we leave some immense decisions to be made by the President and the administration. And I hope that they will be made in the spirit that this Congress across party lines will support the Commander in Chief when he chooses to lead, and that across party lines we understand that partisanship, though it may occasionally rear its head too often perhaps here in Congress, certainly does end at the Nation's coasts when our security and our values are threatened throughout the world.

I thank the Chair. I thank my colleagues for their patience.

I yield the floor.

Mr. ALLARD addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from Colorado.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. ALLARD. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 2:30 p.m. under the same terms as previously agreed to.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. ALLARD. I yield the floor.

Mr. TORRICELLI addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The Senator from New Jersey.

Mr. TORRICELLI. Thank you, Mr. President.

#### A PERSONAL MESSAGE TO SADDAM HUSSEIN

Mr. TORRICELLI. Mr. President, almost 10 years ago I had an opportunity

in visiting Baghdad to meet with Saddam Hussein and members of his cabinet.

I went to Iraq because of a brutal and seemingly endless conflict between the armies of Iran and Iraq that were consuming hundreds of thousands of lives. Like many people in our Government, I was concerned about how this would impact the region, and whether, indeed, it threatened world peace. I left Baghdad with unmistakable impressions of Saddam Hussein who continued to influence my own judgment, and which I revisit now—that we are on the verge of yet another conflict with the army of Iraq.

President Hussein knew little of the Western World, and profoundly misunderstood the United States. Because we are a good and a decent people willing to engage in dialog, it was interpreted as a lack of resolve; a failure of will.

It was for these reasons when President Bush sent American forces to the Persian Gulf that I was proud as a Member of the House of Representatives to be the Democratic sponsor of the war resolution.

In the years since American men and women triumphed in the Persian Gulf war to uphold the will of the United Nations and serve the best traditions of our country, the Saddam Hussein that I met on that day has not only not changed; he remarkably seems to have learned very little.

His rape and pillage of Kuwait is now known to have included not simply combatants but thousands of innocent Kuwaiti citizens. Six years after his retreat from Kuwait he continues to hold 620 unaccounted for Kuwaiti civilians. Upon his retreat he torched the land with oil fires and sullied the water, creating the largest oilspill and oil fires in history.

In 1988, he employed mustard gas against his own people killing more than 5,000 Kurds.

The Saddam Hussein that America met in the Persian Gulf war was not an isolated departure from good judgment. It was part of a long record of brutality against his own people and his neighbors.

Today we are on the verge of yet another conflict with Saddam Hussein, because not only is there a long tradition of such irresponsible international behavior but because nothing seemingly has changed.

In 1992, he violated the terms of the gulf war cease-fire by moving anti-aircraft missiles into northern and southern Iraq. The world responded. The coalition held. And more than 100 United States, British, and French planes fired on missile stations.

A year later—in 1993—still not having learned the price of his misjudgments, Saddam Hussein ordered an attempt on the life of former President George Bush. President Bush was visiting Kuwait. Not only was Saddam Hussein not humbled in the face of the victor; he planned an assassination

leading to an American military response against his intelligence headquarters.

In 1994, he sent battalions of Iraqis 20 miles north of the Kuwaiti border. Again, the United States needed to respond and 40,000 troops were again sent to the Persian Gulf.

And, last year, despite a willingness by the United Nations to begin easing sanctions in order to ease the pain on the Iraqi people in a food for oil program that was instituted, Saddam Hussein responded by military attack against the Kurds in the town of Erbil needing a response with the oil for food program.

There are few comparisons in contemporary history of any leader in any government that has so routinely miscalculated at the disadvantage of his government and himself.

The Saddam Hussein that I met a decade ago may not have understood much about the world, or his place in it, the relative power of his country as opposed to potential adversaries, the use of technology, his measure of international will—his misunderstanding of the United States may have been legendary—but it is almost unbelievable that with these annual confrontations, this extraordinary record of miscalculations, that virtually nothing seems to have been learned.

What more is necessary to be understood about the resolve of the United States? This Government is clearly prepared to pay the price to maintain the peace in the Middle East. This country has a deep determination to deny Saddam Hussein every and all classes of weapons of mass destruction.

The United States will provide leadership for international response when necessary, but clearly is both capable and willing to act unilaterally if required.

What is it, Saddam Hussein, that you do not understand about the world resolve? And what is it about us that could still be unclear?

Last month, this long and extraordinary record of miscalculation added yet another chapter. Saddam Hussein barred access to U.N. weapons inspectors under the pretext that they included American citizens. He challenged the right of the United States to be a part of the inspection teams of the United Nations, and asked rhetorically by what right we would be present.

Saddam Hussein, it comes to mind that the United States has about 500,000 reasons why we have a right to participate and will demand full compliance—a reason for every man and woman that left family, friends and home to put their lives on the line in the Persian Gulf war to end your occupation of Kuwait. And those 500,000 reasons have not yet run their course. They will stand for a long time.

The record since the United Nations began the inspections to ensure compliance with its resolutions has not been without success.

Since 1991, U.N. inspectors have found and destroyed more illegal weapons in Iraq than were destroyed during

the entire Persian Gulf war. Surveillance cameras to monitor weapons activities were installed. This is a regime imposed by the United Nations of weapons inspection that has and can yield real results. But, as we now stand on the verge of yet another military confrontation, it is necessary to face the unmistakable and painful truth that there is no reason to believe that anything has changed in Baghdad.

This week, the Washington Times revealed that Saddam Hussein has been intending to buy five electronic warfare systems that would allow him to detect and destroy radar-evading aircraft.

The weapons markets of the world have routinely been contacted by Iraqi agents and representatives still seeking military technology.

This is important lest we fail to understand that the strategy of frustrating U.N. inspectors and noncompliance is not happening in a vacuum. It is part of an ongoing strategy to restore military capability.

The lessons of the Persian Gulf war and our experience through our sacrifices have yielded more than simply the destruction of these weapons. There is another great lesson that the Persian Gulf war has left the United States, the United Nations and the international community. It is, first, that the international community is capable of acting in concert for common purpose, but it is also that there is by definition a class of nations with leaders who are easily identifiable who are so irresponsible by their actions, who act in such contempt of international normal standards of conduct and international law that the international community will take it upon itself to deny them aspects of their own sovereignty.

Of all the things that Saddam Hussein failed to learn about us and our resolve and our capability or the international community's ability to act in concert it is the single lesson that is the foundation of the current crisis. Saddam Hussein will not be allowed to have weapons of mass destruction or wage war on his own people or regain great military capability because as a consequence of the Persian Gulf war and the invasion of Kuwait, the international community has decided to deny him that sovereign right of other nations to possess certain weapons and conduct their own affairs today, tomorrow and potentially forever.

It is not only a lesson of the Persian Gulf war; it is a gift of this generation to succeeding generations that something has been learned by the history of the 20th century. And the primary pupil of this lesson will be Saddam Hussein, in life or in death, today or tomorrow, one way or another.

I know every Member of this Senate, indeed, the entire U.S. Government, is in prayerful hope that military confrontation is avoided. In an age when military weapons hold such power and the destructive capability is so great,

conflict must always be avoided when possible. That is our nature. It speaks well of our people that this is our resolve.

Saddam Hussein, with so many miscalculations, so many mistakes that caused so much harm for your people, do not miscalculate again.

There is in this Senate, I know, nothing but affection for the people of Iraq, an abiding hope that there will be a day when not only we can meet them again in friendship but the Members of this Senate may vote to send an ambassador of good intention and good will to Baghdad to normalize relations. Between this day and that is either the learning of a fundamental lesson by Saddam Hussein against all odds and all experience or that the people of Iraq take their future in their hands against extraordinary odds and regain responsible leadership.

I do not know, Mr. President, how this crisis will be resolved. Indeed, no one could predict. Only that somehow we be understood and that somehow the United Nations obtain the strength and resolve to see its judgments fulfilled. All the frustration of these years and all the sacrifice from the international community can still have real meaning if this lesson will be learned not simply by Saddam Hussein but by all the dictators, all the despots to come who would abuse their people and wage war. If we can stand together here, finally have the lesson learned, all this will have had real meaning.

Mr. President, I yield the floor.

Mr. COATS addressed the Chair.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. AL-LARD). The Senator from Indiana.

#### EXTENSION OF MORNING BUSINESS

Mr. COATS. I ask unanimous consent that morning business be extended until 3 p.m. under the same terms as previously ordered.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, I ask that I may speak in morning business for up to 10 minutes.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

#### REMARKS OF SARA LISTER

Mr. COATS. Mr. President, on Tuesday of this week, our Nation celebrated Veterans Day. I had the pleasure of returning to Indiana and talking to some of our veterans and speaking to an important group about the meaning of Veterans Day and the contributions veterans have made to our country and their sacrifices. We honor Americans on that day, both men and women, who served in both peace and war, as watchmen and women on the wall of freedom. We honor them by remembering their heroism, passing stories of their character and courage from generation to generation.

It is disappointing and extremely unfortunate that in this very same week

the Assistant Secretary of the Army, Ms. Sara Lister, made some remarks to a group to whom she was speaking at Harvard, referring to members of the U.S. Marine Corps as "extremists." I quote her. She says the Marines are "extremists. Wherever you have extremists, you've got some risks of total disconnection with society. And that's a little dangerous."

Now, subsequently, Ms. Lister has penned a letter of apology to the Commandant of the Marine Corps, General Krulak, in which she says it's unfortunate that my remarks were taken out of context. It's unfortunate that they were misinterpreted.

Now, all of us in the business of politics have had occasion to pick up the paper in the morning and seen our remarks taken out of context and be misinterpreted. So I appreciate that this sort of thing often takes place. I truly hope that in this case these remarks were taken out of context and that they were misinterpreted. I am concerned that they were not. I have asked for a tape or transcript of the presentation by Ms. Lister at the Harvard group so that I can understand the context. It is not really understandable or discernible at this particular point.

I am disturbed that one of our top civilian appointees at the Pentagon could make such a statement. It is hard for me to construct any context in which the use of the word "extremism," and the phrase a "total disconnection between our society" and the U.S. Marine Corps is appropriate. I don't understand in what context that could be presented that would explain the use of those remarks and the statement that this is a "dangerous" situation.

And so I rise today to raise serious questions about the continued leadership of Ms. Lister as Assistant Secretary of the Army. By her remarks, she has offended not only the 174,000 active duty members of the Marine Corps but the 2.1 million Marine Corps veterans and, frankly, all Americans.

The Marine Corps teaches truths and convictions which are becoming more rare in today's society, and it is the continuity of these values in the Marine Corps which has produced men and women of character and honor who are ready and willing to sacrifice their lives in defense of their country.

I would commend to Ms. Lister a piece which appeared in the Sunday Parade magazine, probably in most Sunday papers across our country. It featured a very insightful story of recruits in the Marine Corps and what we can learn from the Marine Corps. The article correctly shows that the Marine Corps teaches and trains young people important values.

If these values are extremism, then I suggest that is what we need more of in this country. Let me just quote a few things from the article.

In a society that seems to have trouble transmitting healthy values, the Marines stand out as a successful institution that unabashedly teaches those values . . .